

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| PPLICATION NO.                       | FILING DATE   | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO      |  |
|--------------------------------------|---------------|----------------------|---------------------|----------------------|--|
| 10/005,196                           | 12/04/2001    | Keith D. Allen       | 632R/40338.28USU1   | 6896                 |  |
| 7590 09/16/2004                      |               |                      | EXAMINER            |                      |  |
| MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.<br>PO BOX 2903 |               |                      | BERTOGLIO,          | VALARIE E            |  |
| Minneapolis, M                       | IN 55402-0903 |                      | ART UNIT            | ART UNIT PAPER NUMBE |  |
|                                      |               |                      | 1632                |                      |  |

DATE MAILED: 09/16/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|  | Application No.   | Applicant(s)  |  |  |  |  |
|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| Advisory Action  | 10/005,196  | ALLEN ET AL.  |  |  |  |  |
| , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,  | Examiner  | Art Unit  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Valarie Bertoglio   | 1632  |  |  |  |  |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe  | ars on the cover sheet with the c   | orrespondence addi  | ress   |  |  |  |
| THE REPLY FILED 08/31/04 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.   |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]   |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| a) The period for reply expires _months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of t (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offic timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C | dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TH date on which the petition under 37 CFF f extension and the corresponding amount he shortened statutory period for reply cellater than three months after the mailing | g date of the final rejection E FINAL REJECTION. R 1.136(a) and the apprount of the fee. The appropriately set in the final ( | on. See MPEP  priate extension  opriate extension  Office action: or |  |  |  |
| 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>30 August 2004</u> . Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.  2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:  |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:  |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| (a) they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);   |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| (b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);   |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or   |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| (d)  they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. NOTE:   |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| $3. \boxtimes$ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection  | on(s): See Continuation Sheet.  |   |  |  |  |  |
| <ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be canceling the non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>  | pe allowable if submitted in a se   | parate, timely filed a  | mendment   |  |  |  |
| 5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for rapplication in condition for allowance because: See  | reconsideration has been consideration Sheet.   | lered but does NOT  | place the  |  |  |  |
| <ol> <li>The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered beca<br/>raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.</li> </ol>  | use it is not directed SOLELY to  | issues which were   | newly  |  |  |  |
| 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(sexplanation of how the new or amended claims wor  | s) a)  will not be entered or b) ☐<br>uld be rejected is provided below   | ⊠ will be entered ar<br>v or appended.  | nd an  |  |  |  |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:   |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) allowed:  |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) objected to:  |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) rejected: <u>6,8,9,23,29-32 and 35-39</u> .   |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:   |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8. The drawing correction filed on is a) appro   | oved or b) disapproved by the   | e Examiner.   |  |  |  |  |
| 9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement  | (s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 0. Other:  |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| Patent and Trademark Office  |   | Poel  | Jostac<br>AUG 32   |  |  |  |

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 11-03) Continuation of 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): The specific scope of enablement rejection relating to claims 23 and 30 as set forth on page 4, paragraphs 4-5 and the paragraph bridging pages 4-5 of the previous office action.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments regarding the utility rejection are not persuasive. The rejection is maintained for reasons of record. The utility of the claimed mouse and methods is not substantial for specific. No clear nexus between the claimed mouse and anxiety has been made. It would require further research to correlate the observed phenotypes with a specific human disorder, including anxiety. Without a correlation to a disorder, one would not know how to use an agent that affects a phenotype of the claimed mouse. Applicant has argued that the mouse can be used to study the function of the FPR-RS4 gene. Basic research such as studying properties of the claimed product is not a substantial utility.